REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending of which claims 10-24 are withdrawn. Claims 1 is currently amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the action mailed December 13, 2006, is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,727,932 (hereinafter "Medved"). The Examiner rejected claims 3-4 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Medved. Applicant traverses the rejections.

Section 102 Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected over Medved. Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a broadband inductor assembly that includes a conical coil inductor, a base, and at least one support. The support provides support for the conical coil inductor raised above the base by a distance greater than or equal to the radius of the broad end of the conical coil inductor. The distance between the base and the conical coil inductor is selected such that the parasitic coupling paths between the conical coil inductor and the base are substantially minimized.

Medved discloses a radio coil assembly for use with an early vacuum tube radio system. Two conical coils are positioned relative to each other such that the spacing between the coils can be adjusted. *See* FIGS. 2-3; page 2 lines 41-49; and page 2, lines 120-127. Varying the spacing between the coils allows the radio coil to be used to consistently receive particular radio frequencies according to the distance set between the coils. *See* page 1, lines 15-26.

While the radio coil in Medved is shown as elevated by a shaft, Medved does not disclose or suggest that the radio coil is elevated by any particular or minimum amount for the purpose of minimizing parasitic coupling paths generated between the radio coil and a base. Instead, the support shaft in Medved provides for a spacing adjustment apparatus for varying the spacing between the pair of conical coils forming the radio coil.

Medved does not disclose or suggest any particular shaft height or any reason to select any particular shaft height. There is no suggestion in Medved that the distance between the conical coils and the base matters with respect to the particular purpose of improving performance of the conical coils. Medved does not disclose or suggest selecting a distance

between the radio coil and the base in order to minimize parasitic coupling paths between the coil and the base, as required by claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Applicant requests that all pending claims be allowed.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8 March 2006

Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50325860.doc